

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/715,965	10/715,965 11/18/2003		James D. Ralph	F-294	5392
51640	7590	.09/19/2006		EXAM	INER
SPINE MI		t al	PHILOGENE, PEDRO		
LERNER, DAVID, et al. 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WESTFIEL	WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			3733	
				DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/715,965	RALPH ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Pedro Philogene	3733
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, to any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r ktion.  y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication. IANDONED (35.U.S.C. § 133)
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n 18 November 2003	
	☐ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for a		ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice u		
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the appli	cation.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-19 is/are wi		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	correction is required if the drawing	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f	oreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority doc		
2. Certified copies of the priority doc		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		received in this National Stage
application from the International		
* See the attached detailed Office action for	r a list of the certified copies not	received.
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-S</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> </ul>		s)/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/8/06</u> .	6)  Other:	* *

Art Unit: 3733

### Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-10, drawn to intervertebral spacer, classified in class 623, subclass 17.11.
- II. Claims 11-19, drawn to an intervertebral insertion tool, classified in class 606, subclass 99.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require the distal end of the tool body having at least two heads that are movable inwardly toward one another. The subcombination has separate utility such as a clipper.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or

includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Michael Doherty on 9/12/06 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Grout I, claims 1-10. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claim11-19 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/715,965

Art Unit: 3733

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3,5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kohrs (6,855,166).

With respect to claims 1-3,5-10, Kohrs discloses an intervertebral spacer device (100) comprising a spacer body dimensioned to fit between two vertebrae, the spacer body having a plurality of outer surfaces, as best seen in FIG.6, the plurality of outer surfaces including a first outer surface (106) and a second outer surface (108), the first and second outer surfaces facing away from one another, as best seen in FIG.6, the spacer body having a plurality of linear grooves (101, 102, 103, 104, 109, 110, 111, 120, 121, 122, 123) engageable by an intervertebral spacer insertion tool (500) having a plurality of linearly extending grooves engagement members, the plurality of linear grooves including a first linear groove formed in the first outer surface and a second linear groove formed in the second outer surface, the first and second linear grooves being parallel to one another (the grooves a the end (101) are parallel to grooves at the end (104); as best seen in FIG.6. Each of the first and second outer surfaces is convex: as best seen in FIG.6. The first outer surface is an upper surface of the spacer body and the second outer surface is a lower surface of the spacer body; as best seen in FIG.6. The plurality of linear grooves comprises a first set of linear grooves formed in the first outer surface and a second set of linear grooves formed in the second outer surface, the first set of linear grooves being parallel to the second set of linear grooves;

Application/Control Number: 10/715,965

Art Unit: 3733

Page 5

as best seen in FIG.8, each linear groove in the first set of linear grooves is directly opposite a respective one of the linear grooves in the second set of linear grooves; as best seen in FIG.8; the spacer body comprises a porous material, selected from porous metal, as set forth in column 3, lines 49-56, each of the first and second linear grooves has a smooth surface; as best seen in FIG.6, one of the first and second outer surfaces is rough, as best seen in the figures.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohrs (6,855,166).

With respect to claims 4, it is noted that Kohrs did not teach of a pillow shape having rounded cornesr and rounded edges; as claimed by applicant. However, this particular configuration is nothing more than one of numerous configurations one of ordinary skill in the art would find obvious for the purpose of providing mating surfaces in the spacer of Kohrs. See in re Dailey 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1976).

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6,270,528

8-2001

McKay

Art Unit: 3733

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro Philogene whose telephone number is (571) 272-4716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on (571) 272 - 4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Pedro Philogene September 13, 2006

PĚĎŘO PHILØGENE PRIMARY EXAMINER